



BOOSTING STUDENT IDEAS THROUGH TEXT MODELLING: A CLASSROOM ACTION RESEARCH ON DISCUSSION WRITING

Yustika Nur Fajriah¹, Rafsya Rachmani², Hoang Thi Tuong Vinh³

^{1,2}English Education Program, Pendidikan Profesi Guru, Institut Pendidikan Indonesia Garut

³Ton Duc Thang University, Vietnam

Corresponding author: yustikanurfajriah@institutpendidikan.ac.id

APA Citation: Fajriah, Y. N., Rachmani, R., & Vinh, H. T. T. (2025). Boosting student ideas through text modelling: a classroom action research on discussion writing. *English Review: Journal of English Education*, 13(2), 529-540. <https://doi.org/10.25134/erjee.v13i2.11838>

Received: 28-02-2024

Accepted: 27-04-2024

Published: 30-06-2025

Abstract: This study investigates the use of Modelling of the Text (MoT) within the Genre-Based Approach (GBA) to enhance students' ability to construct well-supported arguments in discussion texts. Although MoT is recognized as an effective explicit teaching method, its application remains underexplored in academic research. This Classroom Action Research, conducted over two cycles, involved 39 students from a senior high school in West Java, Indonesia, with a particular focus on six participants. Data were collected through classroom observations, tests, and text analysis. Quantitative results demonstrated an overall improvement in writing performance, with students meeting 61% of the writing criteria in Cycle 1 and increasing to 87% in Cycle 2. Specifically, findings from Cycle 1 showed that while students were familiar with the structural components of discussion texts, they faced challenges in developing arguments, integrating evidence, and clearly articulating their stance. In Cycle 2, the introduction of Toulmin's Argumentation Model, practice with counter-arguments, and explicit teaching strategies led to significant improvements in students' writing. These interventions enabled students to construct more coherent arguments, engage in critical reasoning, and effectively incorporate supporting evidence. Based on these results, the study advocates for instructional approaches that extend beyond structural awareness to include targeted teaching of argumentation strategies, stance formulation, and the integration of research and digital literacy skills. Additionally, it recommends differentiated instruction to address diverse learner needs. The study concludes by suggesting further research to examine the long-term effects of these instructional strategies on students' writing proficiency.

Keywords: *discussion texts; explicit teaching, Genre-Based Approach (GBA), Modelling of the text (MoT), writing proficiency.*

INTRODUCTION

In the educational context, text types serve as essential learning materials that support the development of students' literacy and cognition. Among these, argumentative texts hold a particularly important role due to their potential to enhance critical thinking, analytical reasoning, and evidence-based argumentation (Daeng, & Enre, 2024; Demircioglu, Karakus, & Ucar, 2023). As a genre, argumentative writing challenges students to engage with complex issues by considering multiple perspectives and constructing well-supported claims. This process not only involves synthesizing diverse sources of information but also requires the capacity to reason logically, evaluate evidence, and communicate ideas effectively. Furthermore,

mastering argumentative texts is aligned with the goals of 21st-century education, which emphasizes higher-order thinking skills, problem-solving, and the ability to participate meaningfully in academic and civic discourse (Rapanta, 2024; Sarigoz, 2023). Therefore, integrating argumentative texts into the curriculum is not merely a matter of genre instruction but a pedagogical strategy that cultivates thoughtful, reflective, and informed learners.

However, in the Indonesian context, discussion texts are often perceived as particularly challenging for students. Many students are able to recognize the generic structure of a discussion text, yet they struggle to construct well-developed arguments, support claims with evidence, and take

a clear stance in their conclusions (Karakoç, Gu, & Ruegg, 2025). This is supported by several studies indicating that students struggle to produce effective discussion texts, primarily due to the demands of complex reasoning required by the genre (Mallahi, 2024; Wibowo, Ulfaika, & Faridy, 2025). Specifically, many students encounter difficulties in analyzing issues from multiple perspectives, which is a fundamental component of constructing discussion texts. As a result, they often face challenges in articulating their viewpoints in a coherent, structured, and balanced manner. Given the importance of this genre in developing critical and reflective thinking, addressing these challenges is an urgent pedagogical priority.

One of the proposed alternatives to address the aforementioned challenges is the Genre-Based Approach (GBA). This pedagogical framework has been widely advocated in language education due to its structured and scaffolded methodology, which supports students in developing their writing skills—particularly in producing complex genres such as argumentative and discussion texts (Hamman-Ortiz, Schwarz, Hamm-Rodríguez, & Gort, 2023; Insuwan, & Thongrin, (2025). A key component of GBA is the Modelling of the Text (MoT) stage, which provides explicit instruction on text structure and linguistic features (Alwasilah, 2024; Alwasilah, 2025; Baxromovna, 2024). This phase is especially beneficial for students who struggle to generate and organize ideas, as it serves as a bridge between their understanding of the genre and their ability to construct texts independently. Therefore, the modelling phase must be optimized to include not only genre awareness but also argumentation frameworks that support deeper reasoning. Two such frameworks are Toulmin's Argumentation Model—which offers a clear structure for claims, evidence, and rebuttals (Anisa, Widodo, Riandi, & Muslim, 2023; Pulungan, Anshori, Sumiyadi, & Mulyati, 2025). In other words, MoT not only facilitates students' recognition of genre-specific structures and language features but also promotes the development of coherent and contextually appropriate ideas.

To address the above challenges, a study focusing on optimizing GBA through effective modelling techniques is required. Classroom Action Research (CAR) is an appropriate method to investigate and refine instructional strategies, ensuring that students receive the necessary modelling to develop stronger arguments in discussion texts. Conducting CAR is essential

because it allows for in-depth analysis of students' difficulties and provides iterative solutions to improve their writing performance. Through CAR, this study aims to enhance students' engagement with GBA by refining the modelling stage, ensuring that it effectively supports students in developing well-structured and well-supported arguments.

Over the past decade, numerous studies have investigated the implementation of the Genre-Based Approach (GBA), including the *Modelling of the Text* (MoT) stage, in various educational contexts. A substantial body of research has specifically examined the impact of GBA on students' argumentative writing abilities. For instance, several studies have provided empirical evidence supporting the effectiveness of GBA in enhancing students' skills in constructing coherent and well-structured argumentative texts (Fiallos, 2024; Hidayad, Agustin, Despita, & Purwanto, 2023; Su & Zou, 2024; Lin & Arumugam, 2025). These findings highlight GBA's capacity to facilitate students' understanding of argumentative structures and to foster critical thinking through structured writing instruction. In addition, other studies have explored the broader impact of GBA on students' academic writing proficiency (Hastuti & Rini, 2023; Helena, Pujiawati, & Rahmawati, 2024; Hidayat, Fajriah, & Nugraha, 2024; Latif, 2024; Zhai & Razali, 2023). Their research demonstrated that the explicit teaching of genre-specific structures and linguistic features significantly improved students' writing performance. These results suggest that the systematic guidance provided through GBA, particularly during the MoT stage, enables students to internalize academic conventions and apply them effectively in their writing tasks. Collectively, this body of literature affirms the pedagogical value of GBA as a framework that not only supports genre awareness but also enhances overall writing competence.

From the previous studies mentioned above, it can be concluded that while GBA has been widely discussed, its application in modelling remains underexplored. Those studies affirm the benefits of explicit genre instruction, but they rarely focus on how the modelling stage can be strengthened to support the development of argumentation, especially in discussion texts. In addition, few studies have used Classroom Action Research (CAR) to investigate and refine instructional strategies in this specific context. Therefore, this study aims to fill this gap by applying Classroom

Action Research (CAR) to explore how the integration of Toulmin's Model into the modelling phase of GBA can improve students' ability to write well-supported arguments in discussion texts.

Particularly, this research is driven to answer two research questions; (1) How is the Modelling of the Text (MoT) stage implemented across the two cycles of GBA based instruction? (2) How does the Modelling of the Text (MoT) stage contribute to students' development in writing discussion texts as seen from the Cycle 2 (stage of Observing and Reflecting)?

METHOD

This study adopted a Classroom Action Research (CAR) design, characterized as a reflective and cyclical process aimed at improving teaching practices through continuous feedback, evaluation, and refinement (Yusron, Irawati, & Wibowo, 2023;

Ceylan & Comoglu, 2024). It was conducted at a public senior high school in Indonesia known for its strong English-language support through extracurricular programs and professional development activities such as Musyawarah Guru Mata Pelajaran (MGMP). The study involved 39 twelfth-grade students, with six focal participants representing low, medium, and high levels of writing proficiency. These participants were selected based on a pre-cycle writing task evaluated using an analytic rubric adapted from Du and Gao (2024) and Hakimah (2024). The analytic rubric used to assess students' writing was grounded in the concept of genre moves and the linguistic features of discussion texts as informed by Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL). It evaluated four core dimensions of student writing: text structure and organization, language use, coherence and cohesion, and argument development. The first dimension, text structure and organization, assessed the students' ability to realize the conventional stages of a discussion text—namely, the issue, arguments for and against, and conclusion. The second, language use, focused on the accuracy and appropriateness of grammar and vocabulary, particularly those lexico-grammatical choices that realize ideational and interpersonal meanings, such as modality and evaluative language. The third dimension, coherence and cohesion, measured the logical flow between stages and the effective use of cohesive devices such as conjunctions, reference, and lexical chains, fulfilling the textual metafunction. Finally,

argument development captured the clarity of the student's stance, the quality of reasoning, and the integration of supporting evidence. Each dimension was rated on a five-point scale ranging from 0 (inadequate) to 4 (excellent), with detailed descriptors guiding the assessment of observable performance at each level, resulting in a maximum score of 16 points.

Data were collected across two cycles in alignment with the CAR framework. The primary data-collection methods included tests (pre-test and post-test writing tasks) and classroom observations. To ensure a comprehensive understanding of students' writing development and the effectiveness of the instructional strategies, both quantitative and qualitative analysis methods were employed. The quantitative analysis was descriptive, with pre- and post-test scores converted to percentages and compared to observe changes in performance. This provided an overview of learning outcomes without applying inferential statistics. The qualitative strand employed an inductive approach involving categorization, thematic analysis, and interpretation (Fife & Gossner, 2024; Frazer, Orr, & Thielking, 2023). Students' texts from both cycles were analyzed for their development of arguments, clarity of stance, and use of supporting evidence. Classroom observations were also analyzed to explore student engagement during the modelling phase, participation in Argument Relay activities, and application of the writing strategies taught. Finally, students' rubric scores from both cycles were compared to identify specific improvements in structural organization, coherence, argumentation, and language proficiency (Khasanah, Faridi, & Wahyuni, 2023; Xie, 2023).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The finding is divided into two sections; How MoT is conducted through two-cycle CAR design and How MoT develop students' writing of discussion texts.

Research Question 1: How is the Modelling of the Text (MoT) stage implemented across the two cycles of GBA based instruction?

This Classroom Action Research (CAR) was conducted in two iterative cycles following the stages of planning, action, observation, and reflection. In Cycle 1, the primary focus was on identifying students' difficulties in writing discussion texts, especially in developing coherent arguments and clearly stating a stance. Through

the Genre-Based Approach (GBA), students received instruction on the structural and linguistic features of the genre. While some improvement was observed, students continued to struggle with deepening their arguments and effectively using evidence. To address these gaps, Cycle 2 introduced key refinements, including Toulmin's Argumentation Model, explicit stance formulation, and practice with counter-arguments. These enhancements provided students with a more structured framework for developing their ideas and engaging critically with opposing viewpoints.

Cycle 1

Planning

To ensure alignment with the Kurikulum Merdeka for 12th grade, the lesson was designed around the discussion text genre, focusing on the topic of carbon footprint. Prior to implementing the intervention, a diagnostic assessment was conducted by reviewing students' writing portfolios. This assessment identified key challenges in their writing abilities, enabling a classification of students into different proficiency levels (low, middle, high). Based on these findings, the learning objectives were refined to ensure that by the end of the cycle, students would be able to produce a discussion text independently. A writing assessment rubric was adapted to evaluate students' progress while maintaining alignment with the learning goals.

The instructional framework was based on the Genre-Based Approach (GBA), with a particular emphasis on the modelling of the text stage to support students in developing their ideas more effectively. During the Modelling of the Text (MoT) stage, a model discussion text was introduced, accompanied by explicit instructions on its purpose, structure, and linguistic features. To reinforce comprehension, a PowerPoint presentation titled "*How to Develop Ideas in Your Writing*" was designed to provide step-by-step guidance on structuring arguments effectively.

Acting

The action phase involved implementing the planned Genre-Based Approach (GBA) steps, with an emphasis on the modelling stage to support students in generating and structuring their ideas effectively. The activities aimed to address key challenges identified in students' writing, such as difficulties in reinforcing arguments, lack of a clear stance in conclusions, and insufficient use of supporting evidence.

The modelling stage was designed to explicitly teach the purpose, structure, and argumentation strategies within discussion texts. This phase was further enhanced with structured activities to ensure students could analyze and internalize the writing strategies. The steps conducted during modelling stage are:

Text deconstruction. The teacher presented a sample discussion text on carbon footprint, guiding students in analyzing its purpose, generic structure (introduction, arguments for and against, conclusion), and linguistic features. Students worked collaboratively to underline key transition phrases and argument markers (e.g., "on the other hand," "some people argue that...").

Enhanced modelling with explicit instruction. A PowerPoint presentation titled "*How to Develop Ideas in Your Writing*" was introduced to help students understand step-by-step how to construct cohesive and well-supported arguments. The teacher emphasized the importance of stance in the conclusion, explaining how a discussion text differs from an argumentative essay, where conclusions are often left open-ended. Students were given a second discussion text and asked to analyze its argument structure independently, reinforcing their understanding.

Scaffolding Argument Development through Guided Practice. Argument Relay Activity: Each group was given a controversial statement related to carbon footprint and took turns adding supporting and opposing arguments. Guided Questioning for Idea Expansion: The teacher posed targeted questions (e.g., "What real-life examples support this argument?" "What counter arguments might an opposing side present?") to encourage deeper analysis and prevent surface-level reasoning.

Observing

To assess students' progress and the effectiveness of the Genre-Based Approach (GBA) intervention, data were gathered from writing samples and informal student reflections, focusing on argument clarity, structural organization, and evidence use. Six focal participants, selected based on pre-cycle writing and representing varying proficiency levels, offered insights into common strengths and challenges. Overall, students successfully followed the macro-structure of discussion texts, but the depth of argumentation and clarity of stance varied depending on their proficiency.

For example, Student A wrote:

“EVs produce no operational emissions, reduce fossil fuel reliance, and benefit from technological advancements. Battery production, reliance on non-renewable energy, and recycling challenges reduce their environmental benefits.”

While this student presented two sides of the argument, the statements remain superficial and lack elaboration, explanation, or justification. Similarly, Student B stated:

“Consumer Choices Impact Demand: By choosing sustainable products, consumers can encourage companies to adopt greener practices, leading to lower overall emissions.”

Although this sentence identifies a causal link, there is no evidence or real-world example to support the claim, limiting the persuasive power of the argument. In both low-proficiency texts, stance expression was either absent or implicit, showing students’ confusion about the purpose of the concluding paragraph.

At the middle level, some improvement was observed in terms of argument explanation, yet cohesion and evidence use were still weak. For example, Student C explained:

“CFC gas is broken down by UV radiation, then decomposes and releases chlorine atoms. After that, the chlorine atoms react with ozone... This causes increased exposure to UV radiation entering the Earth’s surface.”

This excerpt from a text on aerosol perfume provides detailed explanation, reflecting better understanding of the issue. However, the overall text structure felt fragmented, as emotional appeals and scientific facts were mixed without clear transitions. The student’s conclusion included a stance, but it relied more on subjective reasoning than synthesized arguments.

Among the high-proficiency group, students showed better structural coherence and more developed reasoning. For instance, Student E wrote:

“Mass use of paper can increase the carbon footprint. This is because the main ingredient in making paper is trees... Deforestation can increase the carbon footprint because the trees that are cut down will release the carbon stored in them.”

This student connected cause and effect well and explained the mechanism behind the

argument. However, while the factual content was strong, the writer still relied heavily on repetition and generalized assertions in the conclusion.

The most developed piece came from Student F, who compared fossil fuels and solar energy:

“Solar energy offers minimal environmental impact, high energy efficiency, declining costs, and infinite availability. Fossil fuels, on the other hand, have significant environmental consequences, lower energy efficiency, price volatility, and limited reserves.”

This student clearly contrasted two positions and used formal academic vocabulary and topic-specific knowledge. However, even at this level, the conclusion lacked critical synthesis. Though the writer took a stance, they did not summarize their reasons or refer back to their key arguments.

The analysis revealed that students continued to struggle with expanding arguments, often expressing uncertainty about how to move beyond surface-level reasoning. Their arguments frequently lacked cohesion, leading to fragmented reasoning. Although explicit instruction on text structure was helpful, the teacher observed a need for additional scaffolding, particularly in developing arguments with clearer stance and supporting evidence.

This was echoed in several student reflections. For instance, Student B wrote, “*I feel confused what to write after the first argument. I know what I want to say, but it’s hard to explain why.*”

This comment shows that students could identify opposing viewpoints but lacked strategies to develop those points fully with evidence and reasoning. Based on these insights, it became clear that additional scaffolding was needed, particularly in teaching students how to support claims with factual information and formulate a focused stance in the conclusion.

Reflecting

The reflection phase of Cycle 1 integrated insights from students’ writing samples, classroom observations, and teacher feedback to assess the initial effectiveness of the Genre-Based Approach (GBA) intervention. Findings indicated that students made noticeable progress in identifying and following the generic structure of discussion texts. Activities such as *Argument Relay* fostered greater engagement and collaborative learning, and students began to recognize key linguistic features, including contrastive connectors. These developments suggested that the GBA approach

helped establish foundational genre awareness and promoted active participation in classroom tasks.

However, several challenges persisted in students' argumentative writing. Many students struggled to provide depth in their arguments, often listing points without adequate elaboration or critical engagement. Additionally, a large number of students failed to articulate a clear stance in their conclusions, indicating a possible confusion between discussion and argumentative genres. A significant limitation was the lack of supporting evidence; students tended to rely on vague generalizations rather than concrete facts or authoritative sources. These issues pointed to the need for more explicit instruction on stance development, evidence integration, and the use of structured argumentative frameworks in the next instructional cycle

Cycle 2

Planning (Cycle 2)

Building on the insights from Cycle 1, Cycle 2 of the intervention focused on enhancing students' ability to construct well-supported arguments and clearly articulate a stance in discussion texts. Recognizing that structural awareness alone was insufficient, the instruction emphasized argumentation strategies through the use of Toulmin's Argumentation Model, explicit stance formulation, counter-argument practice, and evidence collection. To boost engagement and relevance, students selected topics of personal interest—such as education, sports, celebrity culture, or politics—with tailored multimodal input provided for each. The introduction of Toulmin's model helped students logically organize claims, evidence, and rebuttals, while a dedicated lesson on sourcing credible data supported the integration of factual evidence. Counter-argument activities and focused instruction on conclusion writing further addressed weaknesses observed in Cycle 1, guiding students to express their viewpoints with greater clarity and persuasiveness. These targeted refinements aimed to move students beyond merely recognizing text structures toward producing coherent, critically reasoned, and impactful discussion texts.

Acting (Cycle 2)

The implementation of Cycle 2 followed the Genre-Based Approach (GBA) structure, incorporating Building Knowledge of the Field (BKoF), Modelling of Text (MoT), and

Independent Construction of Text (ICoT). However, this part solely focused on MoT.

In Cycle 2, the Modelling phase was strategically enhanced to address the weaknesses identified in students' writing during Cycle 1, particularly in argument development and stance articulation. The teacher introduced Toulmin's Argumentation Model, offering step-by-step instruction on its core elements: claims, grounds (evidence), warrants (reasoning), and backing. By breaking down each component, students were guided to understand how logical and persuasive arguments are constructed. Comparative analyses of strong and weak discussion texts were also presented, enabling students to differentiate between well-supported reasoning and superficial assertions. These examples were reinforced through annotated sample texts, where students observed how effective arguments incorporated data, ethical considerations, and counterpoints, particularly in topics such as sports and doping.

In addition, Cycle 2 included a dedicated stance formulation session to help students clearly express their position within the conclusion of their discussion texts—an area many struggled with in Cycle 1. Students were presented with multiple examples of conclusion paragraphs and engaged in critical evaluations to identify which were more convincing and why. Emphasis was placed on the use of mental verbs and stance markers such as *I believe*, *it is evident that*, or *this essay strongly supports*, to reinforce a clear and assertive position. This focused instruction aimed to improve students' ability to construct well-reasoned arguments and confidently state their stance, thus enhancing the overall persuasiveness and coherence of their writing.

Based on the findings discussed above, it is evident that a central focus of this study was the use of explicit modelling to enhance students' argumentation skills. The results align that the modelling phase plays a pivotal role in genre-based pedagogy by allowing students to internalize the textual conventions of a genre before engaging in independent writing (Asbar, Mahmud, & Halim, 2025; Rakrak, 2025; Khasanah et al., 2023). In Cycle 1, although students demonstrated an understanding of the overall structure of discussion texts, they struggled to develop well-substantiated arguments. Their writing often remained at a surface level, lacking detailed support and critical engagement. This outcome is consistent with Sociocultural Theory, which underscores the necessity of scaffolding to bridge the gap between

students' current abilities and their potential development.

Furthermore, the findings expand on previous research (Baxromovna, 2024; Nugraha, Emilia, Gunawan, 2024) by reaffirming that the Modelling of the Text (MoT) stage functions as a crucial scaffolding mechanism within the Genre-Based Approach (GBA). This stage enables students to learn the linguistic and rhetorical features of a genre explicitly, thereby supporting the development of more structured and critically engaged writing.

Significant gains were observed in Cycle 2 following the incorporation of Toulmin's Argumentation Model, which provided a clearer framework for constructing and supporting arguments. Unlike in Cycle 1, where students often simply listed contrasting viewpoints, students in Cycle 2 demonstrated a more coherent use of claims, evidence (grounds), and rebuttals. These results show that effective writing instruction must include explicit teaching of reasoning and evidence-based argumentation (Landrieu, De Smedt, Van Keer, & De Wever, 2024; Morris, Deehan, & MacDonald, 2024). Additionally, the introduction of counter-argument practice helped deepen students'

analytical abilities. Consistently, the inclusion of multiple perspectives encouraged students to write more critical and well-rounded discussion texts (Kilag, Lisao, Lastimoso, Villa, & Miñoza, 2023; Wei & Wu, 2025; Agustina & Ro'isatin, 2024).

Research Question 2: How does the Modelling of the Text (MoT) stage contribute to students' development in writing discussion texts as seen from the Cycle 2 (stage of Observing and Reflecting)?

The analysis focused on students' discussion texts and peer review participation seen from observation and reflection stage.

Observing

From the observation stage, the text analysis showed that students demonstrated notable improvement in constructing well-developed arguments. The statistical data indicated an increase in the quality of students' writing products from Cycle 1 to Cycle 2. In Cycle 1, students met only 61% of the criteria for a well-written text, whereas in Cycle 2, they achieved 87% as provided in the table below.

Table 1. *Visualization of quantitative descriptive results*

No.	Rubric Dimension	Cycle 1 Mean Score	Cycle 2 Mean Score
1.	Text Structure & Organization	2.0	3.5
2.	Language Use	1.5	3.2
3.	Coherence & Cohesion	1.8	3.3
4.	Argument Development	1.7	3.5
Total Score (out 16)		7.0	13.5
Percentage of Filled Criteria		61%	87 %

In comparison to Cycle 1, their written texts in Cycle 2 reflected improved organization, with arguments that followed a more logical sequence and were substantiated with appropriate evidence. Rubric-based evaluations of the six focal participants—spanning low, medium, and high proficiency levels—indicated consistent gains in writing performance. For example, Student A (high proficiency) showed improvement from, particularly in the use of counter-arguments and clarity of stance. Likewise, Student C (moderate proficiency) advanced from offering general statements to integrating expert viewpoints and statistical support. Even Student F, identified as lower proficiency, showed progress in building coherent arguments, despite occasional inconsistencies in cohesion.

A key area of development was the effective use of evidence in argumentation. Whereas many students in Cycle 1 relied on underdeveloped claims, those in Cycle 2 began incorporating factual information, authoritative sources, and logical justifications to strengthen their arguments. For instance, one student, writing about the influence of social media on politics, cited a specific research study to validate their position—demonstrating an increased capacity to include reliable sources in support of their claims. Additionally, students displayed a stronger stance in their conclusions. Instead of writing neutral or inconclusive endings, most students explicitly reaffirmed their position, often using stance markers such as *"Therefore, this essay strongly supports..."* and *"It is evident that..."* to reinforce their viewpoint.

Students showed improvement in incorporating evidence, moving beyond general statements to more substantiated claims. For instance, in Cycle 1, a mid-proficiency student (Student C) wrote:

"On the one hand, private vehicles provide flexibility and mobility for people to travel since they can go anywhere directly."

However, in Cycle 2, the same student strengthened their argument with evidence:

"According to The Guardian, a typical top of the range SUV is responsible for about 35 metric tons of CO₂."

This shift indicates that explicit instruction on evidence collection helped students recognize the importance of supporting claims with credible sources.

In addition, peer review sessions became more meaningful as well. Unlike in Cycle 1, where feedback was often generic (e.g., *"It looks good"* or *"Maybe add more details"*), students in Cycle 2 provided more specific and constructive feedback. Many students referred to Toulmin's Argumentation Model when suggesting improvements, pointing out missing warrants or weak evidence in their peers' drafts. Some students even suggested stronger rebuttals, showing an increased awareness of counter-arguments. Overall, the second cycle demonstrated that explicit instruction on argument structure, evidence collection, and stance formulation had a positive impact (Casado-Ledesma, Cuevas, & Martín, 2023; Zhang, Zhang, & Xu, 2023). Students not only wrote more coherent and persuasive discussion texts but also became more engaged in discussions and peer evaluations.

Reflecting

The reflection from Cycle 2 revealed substantial progress in students' ability to write structured and well-supported discussion texts. Compared to Cycle 1, students showed a better grasp of how to develop arguments by logically connecting claims to evidence and reasoning, largely due to the introduction of Toulmin's Argumentation Model and focused stance instruction. These strategies gave students a clear framework for constructing arguments and formulating stronger conclusions. The use of stance markers led to more assertive endings, replacing the previously vague or neutral conclusions with clearly articulated positions.

Additionally, students demonstrated a more advanced understanding of the role of evidence in persuasive writing. They moved beyond unsupported opinions to incorporate credible data, expert insights, and real-life examples, which enhanced the depth and persuasiveness of their texts. Improvements in cohesion and the ability to anticipate counter-arguments further reflected students' growing command of argumentative writing. While challenges remained—such as refining evidence selection and maintaining consistent depth across proficiency levels—the overall outcomes underscored the value of explicit scaffolding and structured practice. Future instruction should continue leveraging Toulmin's model and scaffolded feedback while integrating strategies that foster critical evaluation of evidence.

To summarize, High-achieving students demonstrated significant improvements in integrating counter-arguments and providing well-reasoned rebuttals. Mid-proficiency students benefited from Toulmin's framework, particularly in structuring claims and evidence. Lower-proficiency students, while showing progress in structuring their arguments, still struggled with coherence and selecting appropriate evidence. These findings suggest that further scaffolding is needed for lower-achieving students to help them critically evaluate and integrate evidence into their writing.

The findings of this study are consistent with prior research on the Genre-Based Approach (GBA) in writing instruction. While students may grasp the structural elements of discussion texts, they often struggle to construct well-developed arguments without explicit scaffolding (Drew, Thomas, & Nagle, 2024; List, 2023). This pattern was evident in Cycle 1, where students produced structurally accurate but conceptually weak texts. However, improvements in Cycle 2, following targeted instruction on evidence integration and stance formulation, the role of explicit teaching in enhancing argument depth and coherence (Gunawan & Wirza, 2025; Landrieu, De Smedt, Van Keer, & De Wever, 2024).

Genre awareness alone is insufficient for developing proficient writing; learners must be given structured opportunities to analyze reasoning and practice argumentation (Söğüt, Civan, & Belli, 2024; Zhou, 2023). Supporting studies (Nguyen & Truong, 2024; Ramadhan & Indriyani, 2023; Wicaksono, Sulistyaningsih, & Syakur, 2023) underscore the importance of modelling activities in strengthening students'

writing capabilities. This was reinforced in Cycle 1, where students, despite understanding genre conventions, had difficulty elaborating on their ideas. In contrast, the use of Toulmin's Argumentation Model and stance formulation training in Cycle 2 offered clearer scaffolding, enabling students to craft more assertive and coherent conclusions. In iterative modelling, students became increasingly confident in evaluating and refining their arguments, demonstrating how sustained exposure to structured guidance promotes deeper engagement with argumentation strategies (Kim & Ro, 2024; Liu, Ismail, & Ahmad, 2024; Rahimi, 2024).

CONCLUSION

This study emphasizes the use of Modelling of the Text (MoT) within the Genre-Based Approach (GBA) to enhance students' ability to construct well-supported arguments in discussion texts. Quantitative data showed a substantial increase in writing quality from 61% of the expected criteria met in Cycle 1 to 87% in Cycle 2. Notably, the findings revealed that while students in Cycle 1 were familiar with the structure of discussion texts, they struggled with developing arguments, integrating evidence, and articulating a clear stance. In Cycle 2, however, the introduction of Toulmin's Argumentation Model, practice with counter-arguments, and explicit stance training led to marked improvements in the quality of students' writing. They were able to structure arguments more coherently, engage in deeper critical reasoning, and incorporate supporting evidence more effectively. Theoretically, this study contributes to the expanding literature on the Genre-Based Approach by demonstrating the value of integrating explicit argumentation instruction into writing pedagogy. It underscores that writing development in EFL contexts requires not only genre familiarity but also deliberate scaffolding of students' cognitive and rhetorical capacities. The successful application of Toulmin's model highlights the pedagogical potential of structured reasoning frameworks in fostering academic literacy and enhancing the quality of student writing.

Based on these results, several recommendations are proposed for the teaching of discussion texts in EFL classrooms. First, modelling should go beyond structural features to include focused instruction on argument construction using frameworks like Toulmin's model. Second, explicit training in stance formulation is essential to support students in

crafting clear and persuasive conclusions. Third, integrating research and digital literacy skills into writing instruction is necessary to help learners identify, assess, and apply credible evidence. Lastly, considering that students respond differently to instructional scaffolding, adopting differentiated instruction is crucial to accommodate diverse learning needs. Future research with larger samples and longer implementation periods is recommended to explore the sustained impact of these instructional strategies on students' writing proficiency.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We would like to express our deepest gratitude to IPI Garut for their continuous support and for providing the necessary resources in the development of this article.

REFERENCES

- Agustina, L., & Ro'isatin, U. A. (2024). The efficacy of case-based learning model integrated with critical thinking skills to improve EFL learners' reading comprehension. *J. Lang. Lang. Teach*, 12(3), 1443-1454.
- Anisa, Widodo, A., Riandi, & Muslim. (2023). Students' argumentation in science lessons: How effective is rebuttal analysis framework in representing the complexity of classroom argumentation?. *Science & Education*, 32(3), 669-687.
- Alwasilah, S. S. (2024). College students' learning outcomes on genre-based approach implementation in teaching a recount text writing. *Innovative: Journal of Social Science Research*, 4(3), 11092-11112.
- Alwasilah, Y. A. (2025). Students' learning outcomes on genre-based approach implementation in teaching a recount text writing. *JEPAL (Journal of English Pedagogy and Applied Linguistics)*, 5(2), 223-237.
- Asbar, A., Mahmud, M., & Halim, A. (2025). Unpacking genre-based instruction: Cognitive, emotional, and behavioral engagement in high school writing. *Seltics Journal: Scope of English Language Teaching Literature and Linguistics*, 8(1), 1-15.
- Baxromovna, S. M. (2024). Implementing task-based instruction and genre-based approaches to develop students' writing skills. *Western European Journal of Linguistics and Education*, 2(4), 118-124.
- Casado-Ledesma, L., Cuevas, I., & Martín, E. (2023). Learning science through argumentative synthesis writing and deliberative dialogues: a comprehensive and effective methodology in secondary education. *Reading and Writing*, 36(4), 965-996.

- Ceylan, E., & Comoglu, I. (2024). Action research in initial EFL teacher education: Emerging insights from a CAR project. *Educational Action Research*, 32(3), 438-453.
- Daeng, L., & Enre, F. (2024). Enhancing argumentative essay writing skills in junior high school students through mind mapping. *International Journal of Curriculum Development, Teaching and Learning Innovation*, 2(2), 61-68.
- Demircioglu, T., Karakus, M., & Ucar, S. (2023). Developing students' critical thinking skills and argumentation abilities through augmented reality-based argumentation activities in science classes. *Science & Education*, 32(4), 1165-1195.
- Drew, S. V., Thomas, J., & Nagle, C. (2024). Improving argument-based explanation writing in inclusive high school science class for students with and without exceptionalities. *Exceptionality*, 32(4), 251-279.
- Du, Y., & Gao, X. (2024). From general critical questions to scheme-relevant critical questions in the instruction on argument evaluation for EFL graduate students: A two-cycle action research. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 71, 101433.
- Fiallos, B. A. G. (2024). Enhancing argumentative writing skills via the process-genre based approach: A quasi-experimental study among university students in ecuador. *Ciencia Latina: Revista Multidisciplinar*, 8(4), 89-111.
- Fife, S. T., & Gossner, J. D. (2024). Deductive qualitative analysis: Evaluating, expanding, and refining theory. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 23, 16094069241244856.
- Frazer, I., Orr, C., & Thielking, M. (2023). Applying the framework method to qualitative psychological research: Methodological overview and worked example. *Qualitative Psychology*, 10(1), 44.
- Gunawan, W., & Wirza, Y. (2025). Teachers' questioning strategies as a scaffold to the middle school students' knowledge in building in constructing hortatory exposition texts: A thematic analysis. *International Journal of Language Education*, 9(1), 18-36.
- Hakimah, N. (2024). Enhancing Students' Descriptive Writing Skills through the Picture Word Inductive Model (PWIM). *English Language and Literature in Education Journal*, 2(2), 42-58.
- Hamman-Ortiz, L., Schwarz, V. S., Hamm-Rodríguez, M., & Gort, M. (2023). Engaging teachers in genre-based pedagogy for writing arguments: A case study of shifts in practice and understanding. *TESOL quarterly*, 57(2), 402-432.
- Hastuti, D., & Rini, S. (2023). GBA and JOSS for Enhancing Students' Writing Proficiency. *Scripta: English Department Journal*, 10(2), 211-218.
- Helena, C., Pujiawati, N., & Rahmawati, M. (2024). Exploring students' response of applying GBA in creative writing: An action research. *Jurnal Ilmiah Wahana Pendidikan*, 10(2), 242-251.
- Hidayad, F., Agustin, A., Despita, D., & Purwanto, M. B. (2023). Implementing writing skills through the genre approach. *INTERACTION: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa*, 10(2), 589-606.
- Hidayat, R. R. A., Fajriah, Y. N., & Nugraha, I. (2024). Integrating multimodal texts in genre-based approach: Teacher's and students' challenges and benefits. *English Education and Applied Linguistics Journal (EEAL Journal)*, 7(1), 13-22.
- Insuwan, C., & Thongrin, S. (2025). Empowering Thai EFL learners as critical thinkers and skilled writers: A genre-based approach with critical pedagogy. *rEFLECTIONS*, 32(1), 487-520.
- Karakoç, A. I., Gu, P., & Ruegg, R. (2025). Designing a rating scale for an integrated reading-writing test: A needs-oriented approach. *Assessing Writing*, 64, 100918.
- Khasanah, N., Faridi, A., & Wahyuni, S. (2023). The implementation of genre-based approach through project-based learning in teaching writing. *English Education Journal*, 13(3), 465-475.
- Kilag, O. K., Lisao, C., Lastimoso, J., Villa, F. L., & Miñoza, C. A. (2023). Building-oriented science education: A critical review of different visions of scientific literacy. *Excellencia: International Multi-disciplinary Journal of Education*, 1(4), 115-127.
- Kim, H., & Ro, E. (2024). Usage-based approaches to assessing syntactic sophistication in second language writing: Interaction of genre and proficiency. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 65, 101131.
- Landrieu, Y., De Smedt, F., Van Keer, H., & De Wever, B. (2024). Argumentation in collaboration: The impact of explicit instruction and collaborative writing on secondary school students' argumentative writing. *Reading and Writing*, 37(6), 1407-1434.
- Latif, O. L. I. A. (2024). Using Genre-Based Approach for Developing Faculty of Education English Majors' Expository Writing and Environmental Awareness. *Journal of Research in Curriculum Instruction and Educational Technology*, 10(2), 295-344.
- Lin, L., & Arumugam, N. (2025). Developing argumentative writing proficiency in Chinese EFL classrooms: A genre-based group writing approach. *Uniglobal Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 4(1), 299-306.
- List, A. (2023). Demonstrating the effectiveness of two scaffolds for fostering students' domain

- perspective reasoning. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 38(4), 1343-1376.
- Liu, H., Ismail, L., & Ahmad, N. K. (2024). Genre-based approaches and ESL/EFL writing: A review of the literature. *World Journal of English Language*, 14(2).
- Mallahi, O. (2024). Exploring the status of argumentative essay writing strategies and problems of Iranian EFL learners. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 9(1), 1-26.
- Morris, C., Deehan, J., & MacDonald, A. (2024). Written argumentation research in English and science: A scoping review. *Cogent Education*, 11(1), 2356983.
- Nguyen, T. T. A., & Truong, V. (2024). The effects of scaffolding in genre-based writing instructions on EFL learners' writing performance. *European Journal of Education and Pedagogy*, 5(1), 23-30.
- Nugraha, I., Emilia, E., & Gunawan, W. (2024). A genre-based approach in teaching multimodal texts. *English Review: Journal of English Education*, 12(3), 1093-1106.
- Pulungan, H., Anshori, D. S., Sumiyadi, S., & Mulyati, Y. (2025). Analyzing political debate strategies: Toulmin's argumentation model in the 2024 Binjai mayoral election. *Journal of Pragmatics and Discourse Research*, 5(1), 58-72.
- Rahimi, M. (2024). Effects of integrating motivational instructional strategies into a process-genre writing instructional approach on students' engagement and argumentative writing. *System*, 121, 103261.
- Rakrak, M. (2025). The genre approach to writing: A socially contextualized pedagogy for effective instruction. *English Language Teaching Journal*, 5(1), 1-9.
- Ramadhan, S., & Indriyani, V. (2023). Genre-based learning model with literacy activities and character strengthening: Effectiveness in language learning. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 14(5), 1384-1394.
- Rapanta, C. (2024). Argument-based teaching: A necessary 21st-century pedagogical practice. *Educação, Sociedade & Culturas*, (67), 1-24.
- Sarigoz, O. (2023). Teaching the 21st century learning skills with the critical thinking technique based on the argumentation method. *Educational Policy Analysis and Strategic Research*, 18(1), 196-218.
- Söğüt, S., Civan, İ., & Belli, S. A. (2024). Exploring genre awareness: L2 learners' voices in tertiary-level writing contexts. *Anadolu Journal of Educational Sciences International*, 14(2), 612-629.
- Su, F., & Zou, D. (2024). A Systematic review of game-based assessment in education in the past decade. *Knowledge Management & E-Learning*, 16(3), 451-476.
- Wei, L., & Wu, Q. (2025). Integrating ideological and political education with critical thinking development in english for graduate students: A pedagogical exploration. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, 13(3), 709-723.
- Wibowo, A. H., Ulfaika, R., & Faridy, A. (2025). Exploring veterinary students' practice and challenges in using quizzz for critical reading in a private university. *Journal of English Teaching, Literature, and Applied Linguistics*, 9(1), 108-115.
- Wicaksono, F. A., Sulistyarningsih, S., & Syakur, A. (2023). A genre-based approach to improve the students' writing skills. *Jurnal Basicedu*, 6(3), 3391-3397.
- Xie, Q. (2023). Assessing source use: Summary vs. reading-to-write argumentative essay. *Assessing Writing*, 57, 100755.
- Yusron, A., Irawati, J., & Wibowo, T. S. (2023). The impact of classroom action research (CAR) and innovation on teacher professionalism: An intervention of competence. *Jurnal Informatika Ekonomi Bisnis*, 5(2), 462-468.
- Zhai, X., & Razali, A. B. (2023). Triple method approach to development of a genre-based approach to teaching ESL/EFL writing: A systematic literature review by bibliometric, content, and scientometric analyses. *SAGE Open*, 13(1), 21582440221147255.
- Zhang, L., Zhang, L. J., & Xu, T. S. (2023). Effects of teacher explicit instruction in stance-taking on students' perceptions of stance and on their academic writing beliefs. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, 1140050.
- Zhou, X. (2023). Teaching activities for English writing: based on a process genre. *English Language Teaching and Linguistics Studies*, 5(2), 208-222.

Yustika Nur Fajriah, Rafsya Rachmani, Hoang Thi Tuong Vinh

Boosting student ideas through text modelling: a classroom action research on discussion writing